

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

fil

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,228	12/28/2000	Jonathan M. Zweig	3239P063	9333
8791	7590 11/03/2006	•	· EXAM	INER
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN			. NGUYEN, TU X	
12400 WILSH SEVENTH FI	IIRE BOULEVARD LOOR	· .	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030		2618		
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/753,228	ZWEIG, JONATHAN M.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tu X Nguyen	2618
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relative to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mai earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed  by (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	•	
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14</u>	August 2006.	
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 6-12,17-19 and 30-38 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5,9 and 20-29 is/ 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 6-12,17-19 and 30-38 is/are rejecte 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	are withdrawn from conside	ration.
Application Papers	or closton requirement.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	nor	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Examiner
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		-
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	* * * *	, ,
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume 4 See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No. <u>60/226,342</u> . received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2618

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6, 30 and 34 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-7, 9-10, 20-21 and 25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Moon et al. (US Patent 6,671,266) in view of Yun (US Patent 6,463,295).

Regarding claims 6, 20 and 25, Moon et al. disclose method comprising:

transmitting a signal having a first level of effective isotropic radiated power by a first wireless electronic device (see 61, fig. 6);

reducing a level of effective isotropic radiated power to a second level of effective isotropic radiated power if a response to the signal is received by the first wireless electronic device within a predetermined period of time (see col.11 lines 41-44).

Moon et al. fail to disclose power in accordance with a logarithmic function.

Yun discloses power in accordance with a logarithmic function (see col.8 lines 39-40).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2618

invention was made to modify the system of Moon with the above teaching of Yun in order to provide power gain (DB) in function of logarithmic calculation.

Regarding claims 7, 21, Moon et al. disclose increasing a level of effective isotropic radiated power to a third level of effective isotropic radiated power if no response to the signal is received by the first wireless electronic device within the predetermined period of time (see col.11 lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 9, the modified Moon et al. disclose the increase of the level of effective isotropic radiated power is performed in accordance with a logarithmic function (see Yun, col.8 lines 39-40).

Regarding claim 10, Moon et al. disclose the first wireless electronic device is an access point (see 61, fig.6, "BS" corresponds to "access point").

Claims 11-12, 22-24 and 27-29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Moon et al. (US Patent 6,671,266) in view of Yun (US Patent 6,463,295) in view of Oberholtzer et al. (US Patent 5,465,399).

Regarding claims 12, 24 and 29, the modified Moon et al. fail to disclose a rate of change from the first level of effective isotropic radiated power to the second level of effective isotropic radiated power is greater than a rate of change from the second level of effective isotropic radiated power to the third level of effective isotropic radiated power.

Oberholtzer et al. disclose the second power level is greater than the first power level and the first power level is greater than the third power level (see abstract, Oberholtzer et al. teaching minimum power < increase power by Pd < maximum power). Therefore, It would have been

Art Unit: 2618

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Moon et al. with the above teaching of Oberholtzer et al. in order to provide incrementally power from minimum power level up to maximum power level).

Regarding claims 11, 22-23 and 27-28, the modified Moon et al. fail to disclose the second power level is greater than the first power level and the first power level is greater than the third power level.

Oberholtzer et al. disclose the second power level is greater than the first power level and the first power level is greater than the third power level (see abstract, Oberholtzer et al. teaching minimum power < increase power by Pd < maximum power). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Moon et al. with the above teaching of Oberholtzer et al. in order to provide incrementally power from minimum power level up to maximum power level).

Claims 17-19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moon et al. (US Patent 6,671,266) in view of Yun further in view of Lappetelainen et al. (US Patent 6,842,605).

Regarding claims 17-18, the modified Moon et al. fail to disclose the response to the signal is a beacon from a second wireless electronic device.

Lappetelainen et al. disclose the response to the signal is a beacon from a second wireless electronic device (see col.7 lines 19-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Moon

Art Unit: 2618

et al. with the above teaching of Lappetelainen et al. in order to indicate power require to the mobile station.

Regarding claim 19, the modified Moon et al. disclose the response to the signal is a message from a second wireless electronic device (see Lappetelainen et al., col.7 lines 43-44).

Claims 32-33, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by Porter et al. (US Patent 6,745,013).

Regarding claims 32-33, Porter et al. fails to disclose the setting of the power level includes increasing the power level of the signal if the first suggested power level is greater that the first determined power level. The Examiner takes an Official notice is taken that the concept adjusting transmission power is well known in the art. It would have been obvious the transmission power signal is adjusted bases on measurement of a reception signal and being compared with a predetermine threshold, wherein the threshold value based on other factors such interference of propagation delay value.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

<sup>(</sup>e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2618

Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Porter et al. (US Patent 6,745,013).

Regarding claim 30, Porter et al. disclose a method comprising: receiving a signal from a first wireless electronic device; determining a power level of the signal (see col.2 lines 34-45); comparing the power level to determined power levels stored within entries of a conversion table, the conversion table including a plurality of entries associated with determined power levels and a plurality of entries associated with suggested power levels, each suggested power level corresponding to one of the determined power levels; and setting the power level of the signal to a first suggested power level of the suggested power levels corresponding to a first determined power level of the determined power levels if the power level matches the first determined power level (see col.3 lines 18-24).

Regarding claim 31, Porter et al. disclose maintaining the power level of the signal if the power level fails to match any power level of the first group of determined power levels (see col.8 lines45-60).

Claims 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Feder et al. (US Patent 6,438,363).

Regarding claim 34, Feder et al. disclose a method comprising: detecting a beacon from a neighboring access point by a device (see col.6 lines 10-11); determining a power level of the beacon (see col.6 lines 31-32); and decreasing a power level for transmission of signals from the device upon detecting that the power level of the beacon is greater than a predetermined power level threshold (see col.8 lines 22-25).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 35, Feder et al. disclose device being an access point (see col.8 lines 22-25).

Regarding claim 36, Feder et al. disclose maintaining maximum power levels of received beacons from neighboring access points including the neighboring access point (see col.7 lines 59-60).

Regarding claim 37, Feder et al. disclose periodically transmitting beacons from the access point at a designated power level greater than the power level to enable other neighboring access points to access channel conditions (see col.7 lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 38, Feder et al. disclose the designated power level is a full power transmission level (see col.7 lines 59-60).

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7883.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban, can be reached at (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2618

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10/24/06